

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1860.

NO. 43.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above Harper's Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—in the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promise; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editor friendly, please copy, or notice.

WAY-MARKS IN THE MORAL WAR WITH SLAVERY.

BY REV. HENRY T. CHEEVER.

N. XVII.

The friends of the enslaved have reason to be thankful, that out of the discussions of the last year, in connection with the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and especially out of the war that has raged around the Church of the Puritans, a great deal of rubbish has been cleared away from principles, and the positions to be taken by the people of God, are more clearly defined, and impregnably intrenched. A broad basis for united and vigorous action against slavery in the churches, is being gradually established and made known, upon which the majority of Christian churches will yet be arrayed.

I. In the first place, it is a great gain to have the meaning of *slaveholding** well settled and agreed upon, once more. Not that the Dictionary, slave-codes and laws, judicial decisions innumerable, and common usage, had not long since agreed in making *slaveholding* to be, and to express the *holding of human beings as property*. But it had come to pass that apologists for American Slavery in the Pulpit, the Church, the Editorial Chair, and in the great Associations of benevolence, had so confused facts, and confounded moral distinctions, by the prefixes applied to *slaveholding*, and by the common use of such qualifying terms as *benevolent slaveholding*, *involuntary slaveholding*, *legal slaveholding*, *Christian slaveholding*, *unselfish slaveholding*, *innocent slaveholding*, that the real and only meaning of *slaveholding*, viz: *the holding of a human being as property*, was lost sight of, and was going out of use.

Many persons in and out of New England, who called themselves Anti-Slavery, had become unwilling to admit that *slaveholding* was sinful, in itself, because they had heard so much, before Tract Societies, and Missionary Boards, and General Assemblies, Conferences, and Associations, of the innocence of the “*legal relation*” of slaveholders, and of the guiltlessness of *nominal slaveholding*, *external slaveholding*, *apparent slaveholding*, and of “*slaveholding that was made unavoidable by the laws of the State*, the obligations of guardianship, and the demands of humanity,” and because they had been so impressed by great names, in debate, with the importance of distinguishing between “*organic sins*” and *individual sins*, between a social sin and a personal sin, between the sin of a vicious system and the sin of one unfortunately involved in that system; and because, moreover, they had been so often warned by grave and reverend divines, and acute doctors, of the danger of holding that an abstract wrong, like slavery, was always necessarily a con-

crete sin in the act of *slaveholding*, and of ignoring the difference between an *objective wrong*, which is always and unchangeably wrong, and a *subjective wrong*, like slavery, which is to be measured entirely by the circumstances of the individual committing it. This darkening of the world, for many years, by words without knowledge, and by sophistical distinctions without a difference, in the interest of slavery, on the part of ministers and ecclesiastical leaders, deceived many, and greatly retarded the progress of Christian abolitionism in the churches.

A real service, therefore, was done, in September last, to the cause of freedom and abolitionism, (although without being intended, in just that way) when, in the Resolution of the New York General Association, declaring *slaveholding* to be such a sin that the renunciation of it ought to be made a condition of church-membership, the six words, *holding of human beings as property*, were substituted for the one word, *slaveholding*, thereby defining the term *slaveholding** according as it had been always understood by abolitionists.

This was what the United Presbyterian Church had said in these terms:

“Slaveholding, that is, the holding of unoffending human beings in involuntary bondage, and considering and treating them as property, and subject to be bought or sold, is a violation of the law of God, and contrary both to the letter and spirit of Christianity.”

And the Old School Covenanter synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, had affirmed the same in their Resolution at Pittsburgh, 1859,

“That Slavery—the holding of man as property, to be bought and sold as a chattel personal—is a *malum per se*, an evil in itself, wholly at variance with every precept of the Divine Word, and a great outrage upon every attribute of our common humanity.”

*Let us affix to this word *Slaveholding*, the blackest stigma of crime that God’s truth allows; let us brand its guilt with the utmost degree of reprobation marked for it in the Word of God, going just as far as God permits, and no farther. Then we are right, but with any thing less than God’s truth, in the conflict against this damning sin, we are wrong. We must take the Prophet Nathan’s mode, not waiting to settle definitions, or make a compromise by abstractions but declaring plainly, This is the sin, and thou art the man.

And we must beware of giving to our adversaries, by means of these abstractions and hair-splitting, and word technicalities, the very opportunity of evasion which they desire. We only manufacture a shield for the slaveholder, and cover his guilt with it, by this tenderness as to slaveholding, this reluctance to stamp the act of sin as sin, and to connect the quality of guilt always with the name. The policy of admitting that there can possibly be such a thing as a just and Christian slaveholding, reminds us of what Dr. Rae told us, in his lecture at New York, on the wonders of the Arctic regions, about the sagacity of the foxes in stealing and devouring the hares. He said that in order to get near enough to their prey to seize them, the foxes would imitate the position, motion, and appearance of the hares, squatting on their hind legs, hanging down their forelegs, elongating their ears, and thus they would get near enough to their unsuspecting victims to seize and destroy them. And thus the slaveholder will grasp and detain his victims, by the pretence of doing it as a Christian, with good intentions, and under justificatory circumstances. Admit that slaveholding is ever consistent with Christianity, and foxes might not only make themselves hares, but wolves lambs, on such a principle. Let us call things by their right names.

By refusing to brand *slaveholding* as sin, you enable him (the slaveholder,) to steal away his prey, unscathed by the charge of God’s Word against him. He takes your bait, but avoids your shot; and you cannot touch him. It is not possible to level him, but with the grape-shot of God’s Word, fired right at him, as a slaveholder, and at his slaveholding, as always sin. You can do nothing but with the utmost plainness, applying the very denunciations of the Word of God. Use God’s Word as he gave it to be used, and you will conquer. But you will never conquer by a war upon mere deserted outposts, by preaching or tract-making on the moral duties that grow out of the existence of slavery as an institution, or the evils of its abuse.

You will never conquer by inquiring, as has been done deliberately, in high quarters, as if it were a knock-down argument, Is Judge Jessup an Abolitionist? Is Dr. Tyng an Abolitionist? Is Dr. Gorden an Abolitionist? Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? This expediency is the religion and tactics of snobs, and we ought not, as Christian men, to suffer ourselves to come within a hundred thousand leagues of adopting it. Let us cast ourselves on God, and on the word of his power, which is able to save us. Let us take that word as our weapon, and strike with it, and advance with it, as God would have us do, and God will be with us, and we shall be strong in him, although this movement in its beginning should be reduced down, not to Gideon’s three hundred, but to only three.—Dr. Cheever—Speech before the Worcester Convention, to form the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

*That ambiguous and evasive term *slaveholding* makes all the mischief.—N. Y. Ind.

This phraseology is clear, and it indicates just what *slaveholding* is, neither more nor less, and just what Christian abolitionists are trying to abolish, by the force of truth. Abolitionism is the maintaining that *slaveholding* is such a sin, and crime, in itself, that it ought at once to be abandoned, and slavery to be abolished. This, and this only, is what the churches have to deal with, under the terms *slaveholding* and *abolitionism*. The stone of stumbling, the rock of offence, in *Christian abolitionism* is, that it requires *slaveholding* to be treated in the church as an immorality, and its renunciation to be insisted upon, as a condition of church-membership and communion, and upon this simple question of abolitionism, the churches everywhere will have to take sides for, or against.

Thanks to God, the fog about this has cleared away, and every one now understands that to be a Christian abolitionist, is to maintain the sinfulness of *slaveholding* in itself, and the duty of suppressing it in the church, by having no fellowship with it, as being one of the unfruitful works of darkness which we are required, by Christianity, to renounce.

This is the position of the Church of the Puritans and its Pastor, for the earnest maintenance of which they suffer because neither public opinion, nor the majority of Northern churches have yet come to this, but on the contrary regard it as highly obnoxious, and the maintenance of such a position as unchristian, fanatical, impracticable, and foolish. In pushing such a position as if we meant to carry it, there must therefore be conflict. From the very nature of things it cannot be avoided. But the issue is certain victory to the party of progress, and that, not far off.

II. There is advancement in another quarter, for which the friends of the enslaved have reason to be thankful, and to take courage. In an editorial in the New York Independent of March 22d, 1860, Dr. Cheever is called “That eminent witness for an almost universally repudiated principle of church discipline, viz: the excommunicating or excommunicating of slaveholders.” But in an editorial of July 26th, after it had become important, as a means of defeating the “British Aid Mission” from the Church of the Puritans, to prove that “Dr. Cheever himself is only a product and a representative of the genuine Christian Anti-Slavery sentiment in the United States,” and that “money contributed to the Church of the Puritans would not further the cause of anti-slavery,” any more than if given to any other church, the same Independent says, “No Church is worthy to be recognized as a church of Christ, which does not regard the holding of human beings as property, as a sin to be dealt with by the discipline of the church.”

That is, the Independent has now reached the conclusion, that “the almost universally repudiated principle of church discipline which excommunicates slaveholders,” is so vital a one, that forgetting its former throw at “that eminent witness,” it now holds that *no church* is worthy to be recognized as a church of Christ, which does not regard the holding of human beings as property, as a sin to be dealt with by the discipline of the church.

Men will judge for themselves, how much this later conclusion of the Independent, so directly in the teeth of its former position, is due to the present necessity of proving to the British public the rather unmanageable thesis, that the American Congregationalists generally, are as good abolitionists as Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans; and, therefore, that there is no more need of their appealing to British Christians for aid, than there is for our other ministers and churches to do so.

But, however brought about, it is a matter of fervent rejoicing that so influential a journal as the Independent,

is at length flat-footed upon the ground taken by the church Anti-Slavery Society, in the third article of its Declaration of Principle, viz : THE SYSTEM OF AMERICAN SLAVERY AND THE PRACTICE OF SLAVEHOLDING ESSENTIALLY SINFUL AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN, AND TO BE DEALT WITH, THEREFORE, AS SUCH BY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND MINISTERS.

Henceforth the New York Independent is to be regarded as holding (*at least on the English side of the water,*) that no church is worthy to be recognized as a church of Christ, which does not regard the sinful and anti-christian practice of slaveholding, as a sin to be dealt with by the discipline of the church. Let it be noted as an era in the moral war with slavery, that the distinguishing principle of christian abolitionism should now be so embraced by the New York Independent, although a few months ago "it could not oblige the Principia by entering into that wordy warfare which marks a certain school of abolitionists."

The "wordy warfare" will not be necessary, now that the Independent itself and that school of christian abolitionists are together upon the platform[†] of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, until now, ignored, viz : THE SYSTEM OF AMERICAN SLAVERY AND THE PRACTICE OF SLAVEHOLDING ESSENTIALLY SINFUL AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN, AND TO BE DEALT WITH, THEREFORE, AS SUCH BY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND MINISTERS.

[†]When they, anti-slavery Christians, awoke to the conviction that slavery ought to be excluded from the churches, they soon saw, also, the difficulty of carrying that conviction into immediate practical effect. So, instead of affirming the simple and plain principle that slaveholding ought not to be tolerated in the church, they spoke in carefully measured phrases, dwelt on exceptions, and put in saving clauses, the practical tendency of which is to shield the sin, and give it at least the quasi sanction of the church indefinitely. The history of the churches in this country show that individual churches and denominations have freed themselves from the sin by a plain simple condemnation of slavery practically enforced. But if any church or denomination has rid itself of slavery by dwelling on exceptions or leaving room for *innocent* slaveholders we have yet to learn the fact. The true way is to proclaim the true principle and trust to time and persuasion to bring men up to it, rather than fetter all future progress with a rule made up of exceptions. *Maine Evangelist, July 26, 1860.*

A TRANSIENT PARTY.

A party, to have a permanent existence, must be based on, or devoted to, a principle which in its ultimate, if not its present manifestations, is fundamental and enduring in its nature. Humanity never anchors permanently elsewhere. Absolute right or wrong alone, makes permanent decisions, and forms the basis of parties. Now "Squatter Sovereignty" has no such quality, and by no possibility can become the basis of a permanent party.

It will not be denied nor disputed that the only significance belonging to Squatter Sovereignty, as it relates to the Douglas party, is in connection with slaves and slavery. To vote slavery up or down, or to vote people in or out of slavery, is the only case in which it is in dispute, and the only question in which it is used by the Douglas party. Such being the case, it is but a simple process to show that the idea lacks all basis, and must be exceedingly fleeting and temporary in its nature.—Thus, negroes, who are the subject of this Squatter Sovereignty principle, are either men or they are not. This cannot be disputed. If they are men, then certainly it cannot be a principle that their personal rights are subject to the will of the majority. All men, says the Declaration of Independence, have certain inherent and inalienable rights, among which are *life, liberty, &c.* This principle is the very basis of all democracy, and of our Republican institutions, and if denied, ignored, or set aside, democracy or republicanism are at once destroyed. Then if the negroes are men, it is quite plain that the doctrine which denies them inherent rights, and makes their life and liberty to depend on the interest of other men, and the deliberation of a town caucus, is the antipodes of the doctrine of our government, lacks fidelity, and no party can rise to success on it, except as it overthrows the government in its rise.

On the other hand, if the negroes are not men, then certainly the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty is unfounded and mischievous, for when was the ownership of horses, cattle, wagons, plows, or any other *property*, made the subject of a town caucus or a popular vote? They are *men or property*; nothing is more certain. There is no medium ground they can occupy. The plea that they may hold the relation of children, or wards, don't touch the difficulty, and is a mere subterfuge; for the reason that the condition of slavery which is the point in issue, has no kind of relationship to minorship or wardship. It is a distinct and peculiar relation, paralleled on earth by nothing but itself, and must be considered by itself. Then, we say, they are *men or property*; and, we respectfully ask any Douglas man who feels an interest in understanding himself, or having any person else understand, the full scope and intent of the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, to tell us on what principle it can be applied to either of these conditions? Let us have a distinct reply to the questions: if they are *men*, are their "*life and liberty*" properly the subjects of the

popular vote? if they are *property*, are they properly the subjects of a popular vote? They are direct and plain questions, and may be, but we presume will not be, answered with equal directness.

We place this thing in what appears to us a clear and unmistakable light, to show that the Douglas party has no substantial foundation. A colony founded on an iceberg, making its way rapidly to the seas of the torrid zone, would be no more certain of speedily finding themselves without any visible means of support, than will the Douglas party after this election is over. It is founded on a fallacy. It has neither the right nor the wrong of the case. It lacks the strength of *evil*, or the vitality and endurance of *good*, and, after a meteor light fizz, must disappear. Douglas is not the first man who lashed the angry Hellespont, and commanded peace; nor is he the first who has planted his chair on the sea strand, telling the waves thus far, and no farther. Nor, indeed, is he the first who has had his foolish adherents to command his "pluck," and flatter him that his voice will prove potent to still the waves and stay the tide. He may not be the last; though he will most certainly add another to the catalogue of examples of the vanity and foolish impotency of all such efforts.—*Wis. Free Dem.*

The argument of the *Free Democrat* is a conclusive one. The Douglas party must be "a transient party" for the reasons above stated. But did it never occur to the editor who wrote it, that the Republican, or Lincoln party, can never be a permanent party, for the same reason? The entire article needs little more than the change of a few words, to make it as conclusive in the latter case as in the former. "Non-extension" equally with "Squatter Sovereignty" is destitute of the conditions of permanency laid down by the *Free Democrat*. The Douglas party hinges upon the incident of "voting slavery up or down," in a given region of country. The Lincoln party upon the incident of voting slavery *in or out* of a given region of country, both parties agreeing that in certain other regions, slavery may be voted both up and in.

Let the reader test this by reading over the above argument again, but substituting "Non-extension," for "Squatter Sovereignty" and "Lincoln" for "Douglas"—For "negroes" substitute "slaves." For "town caucus" put a "State Legislature." For "the will of the majority," put "the place of their location," &c.

Then ask yourself whether the argument is not as good against the permanency of the Republican party, (whether victorious or otherwise, in 1860), as it is against the permanency of the Douglas Democracy. If not, why not?

The foundation fallacy of the Republican and Douglas Democratic parties, is, in substance, one and the same. Both admit a "State Sovereignty" that can "vote slavery up or down," in or out. Both accordingly admit that a "Sovereign State" may decide whether a certain portion of its inhabitants by holding another *certain* portion of them as *chattels*, can deprive them of Federal citizenship, and oblige the Federal Government to dispense with their services as Federal citizens, and to withhold from them Federal protection. Both the parties, alike, pledge themselves to recognize and protect this right of the majority in a "Sovereign State," to vote the minority to be slaves, and out of the protection of the Federal Government.

"Negroes who are the subjects of this State Sovereignty" principle, are either men or they are not. This cannot be disputed. If they are men, then, certainly, it cannot be a principle that their personal rights are subject to the will of the majority, &c., &c., precisely as the *Free Democrat* says of the negroes in the Territories. Hence "it cannot be a principle" that there is any such "State Sovereignty" to be recognized, or that the Federal Government can be absolved, by any exercise of "State Sovereignty," from its constitutional obligation to protect as citizens, all its native born inhabitants alike, as the Constitution in its very first paragraph enjoins, announcing its grand object to be "to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty to all the people of the United States, and their posterity." All this, however, the Republican party, equally with the Douglas Democracy, ignores, even pledging itself that, in its exercise of Federal power, it will not interfere for the protection of its citizens, whom "State Sovereignty" may have thus enslaved. But, in the language of the *Free Democrat*—"absolute right or wrong alone, alone makes permanent decisions, and forms the basis of parties." Hence neither of those parties can be permanent.

We have shown wherein the Republican party and the Douglas Democracy agree. We now inquire wherein do they disagree?

The Douglas Democracy having assumed that "absolute right and wrong" may be set aside by "State Sovereignty," and that slavery in the States may be "voted up or down," at pleasure, (and having been, and still being kept in countenance by the assent of the Republican party, to this position), is encouraged to go one step further, and to claim that those, who, as agreed by common consent, may hold slaves in the States, may hold them in the Territories likewise—that, as slavery may be "voted up or down" in the States, so it may be voted up or down in the Territories. If the Federal Government cannot protect Federal citizens, nor determine who are Federal citizens in the States, and by whose people the Constitution was formed, the Douglas Democrats do not see how the Federal Government can do it in the Territories. They infer that if the Federal Government cannot "establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty" for "the people of the United States," who ordained and established it for that very purpose, they cannot do more for the people of the Territories, outside of the States, who have not yet come into the compact.

Just here, the Republicans part company with them. They are willing so to construe the Constitution that it cannot "establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty" to the "people of the United States" of whom, they themselves, constitute a part. But they insist that the Federal Government has power to do for the people of the Territories what they admit it cannot do for the people of the States. And they base their claim wholly upon a provision of the Constitution, that "Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory, or other property belonging to the United States.

Is this building "a party, to have a permanent existence, based on, and devoted to a principle, which" is "fundamental and enduring in its nature?" Can "humanity anchor permanently" there? Will a party secure liberty for new Territories, that cannot secure it for the original States, for whose benefit the Government was established, and by which it must be administered? Will a nation, a Government, or a people, that cannot secure its own liberties at home, secure the liberties of its dependencies, abroad? And this, too, in the prospect that the Territory is soon to become an integral part of the nation, a State of the Union, at which instant the security of its liberty is to be withdrawn? Is this building a party for permanence on "the basis of absolute right?"

The Republican party, as we have shown, is based upon the same grand premises as the Douglas Democracy, namely, the "State Sovereignty" of transforming *men* into *property*. It has only to draw logical conclusions from these premises, as does the Douglas Democracy, in order to arrive at similar results. The process is rapidly going on already. Two years ago, an intelligent Republican confessed to us, that his own mind, and the minds of his political associates, were undergoing a great change on that subject, and that the views of Mr. Douglas were gaining ground among Republicans. The Republican vote in Congress, on the Crittenden Lecompton bill, was an almost, or quite unanimous relinquishment of their principles, for the time being, a fact which Mr. Douglas and his partisans, are now using effectively against them. The numerous local coalitions between Republicans and Douglas Democrats, soon after, in the elections of members of Congress, gave evidence of a disposition to make the compromise permanent. So did the N. Y. Tribune's advocacy of a Republican acceptance of Douglas as candidate for U. S. Senator in Illinois, in preference to running Lincoln against him. Had the advice been followed, the advocacy of Douglas as the Republican candidate for the Presidency, or instead of such candidate, would probably have been the next move. In Connecticut, the Republicans kept their ranks together, only by erecting a "Squatter Sovereignty Platform, on which to carry their State election. The recent Republican vote in Congress, on Eli Thayer's movement, shows that the members voting, were nearly equally divided on the "Squatter Sovereignty" question, and that above one third of the whole number, did not vote at all, leaving less than one third of the whole number who stood firm against the "Squatter Sovereignty" doctrine, in its strongest form. The Chicago platform, carefully studied, reveals the fact that it contains no definite pledge to carry out the principle of Congressional intervention, a fact noticed by politicians of

different parties, and largely counted on, to attract conservative votes. And finally, the N. Y. Times, an earnest supporter of Lincoln, admits frankly, that the Government will be administered on the Squatter Sovereignty principle, whatever party comes into power; and that if Douglas were the only candidate who would carry out the principle, he would be a formidable rival of Lincoln.

In view of all this, we submit that the Republican party, equally with the Douglas Democracy, lacks the elements of a permanent party, according to the reasonings of the Wisconsin Free Democrat, which we hold to be sound and unanswerable.

On some points, the claim of the Douglas Democracy for the right to establish slavery in the Territories, is less outrageously absurd than the concession of both Republicans and Democrats, of the right to establish or restrain slavery in the States. It is only claimed for slavery in the Territories, that it may be established by the *popular vote*, whereas the slavery conceded to be a State right in the States, never had the sanction of any popular vote, at all, nor even of any legislative enactment creating it, as is attested by Calhoun, Porter, Matthews, Mason, and the entire South.

Against this, it will be useless to urge the absence of Federal authority, to interfere with slavery in the States. This is but begging the question. The question of the absence of that authority, hinges upon, or is identical with the question of the State right to chattelize Federal citizens and thus to withdraw Federal protection from them—or from those who would otherwise be Federal citizens. If the Federal Government recognizes such an act of State Sovereignty, it participates in it. If not, its authority and duty to protect all its citizens, of all colors and conditions, is affirmed by it.

Thus, every question concerning slavery, whether in the nation, the States, or the Territories, must ultimately be determined by the *principle* laid down by the Wisconsin Free Democrat, in its treatment of the slave question in the Territories. And no party that touches the slavery question at all, (and every party must touch it), can be a PERMANENT PARTY without planting itself upon "the absolute right or wrong" of the question, and constantly adhering to the principle of right, whether in relation to State, National or Territorial politics.

For the Principia.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

NO. X.

Between the darkest Ethiopian and the lightest Caucasian are a thousand different shades. Is there a moral rule for every shade? No, "Render to all their due," is the one comprehensive moral precept for all. In doing to others as we would have them do to us we do not regard white or black. Right and wrong have nothing to do with complexions. What, then, has government to do with them? And why is it careful to inform us, every ten years that there are so many blacks and so many whites?

A notion of negro inferiority has by its currency acquired almost the power of a first principle or self-evident truth. But the practical inference drawn from this notion is just the opposite of what it should be. Instead of leading to a more condescending treatment of the black man, the alleged inferiority has been used as a plea, in the absence of a better, for excluding him from an equality of privilege. Besides the cruel use of the plea, it is applied with unreasonable partiality. White intellect occupies every grade from that of John C. Calhoun or Daniel Webster down to that of an idiot. Whether the black man rises as high intellectually as the white man or not, he can descend no lower than the white man's idiocy. Every grade of the black man's intellect is matched by a corresponding grade of white intellect, unless we admit that the black man rises higher than the white. In descending the scale of intellect, then, if there is any point where those below should be denied social equality with those above, fix a mark at that point. Now, let us have fairness and no respect of persons. If any negro can reach the mark, bid him to an equality with the white man above it. If there be white men below the mark, count them as negroes. Such should be the manner of applying an intellectual test, or else there should be no such thing.

If we regard only native intellect, and place the mark so high that no black man can reach it, there probably will

not be white men enough above it to represent us in Congress, if we can even be sure of a white President. The intellectual superiority of the white race over the black, if it is anything more than a groundless conceit of the white man, cannot, after all, amount to much. A black Toussaint is quite equal to a White Washington. We probably have negro men of natural talent, decidedly superior to some who have held the highest position in our national Government. But if the white man is really superior to the black, does it not become him to show his superiority, not by vain boasting, but by a moral dignity, above the meanness of prejudice. Is it a proof of noble superiority to take advantage against intellectual weakness, or to lay men under social disadvantages, on the ground of difference of complexion?

There is nothing unreasonable in the apprehension that the senseless prejudice against color may yet be the foundation of an exterminating war between the races. If our memory is not at fault, John Quincy Adams once gave free utterance to such an apprehension on the floor of Congress. To counteract the prejudice, and promote harmony and equality between the races, would be a wise and legitimate exercise of National Sovereignty.

We may possibly pursue this subject in future articles.

I. S.

For the Principia.

UNPALATABLE TRUTHS.

In a forcible review of Professor Cleveland's recent tract, entitled "Gospel Preaching: What is it?" published by the Cincinnati Reform Book and Tract Society—we find the following papers, which reflect too truly upon the derelictions of the American Pulpit of this day:

As the seeds of weeds are never sown by the husbandman but grow up spontaneously, unless the ground is ploughed and pre-occupied by good seed, so if the ministry does not rebuke open sin, and all sin, because it is sin, it will spring up and grow like the deadly nightshade and keep all the virtues sickly and stunted, beneath its evil influence. We must either become Atheists and infidels at once, or else regard the Gospel as the sworn and uncompromising foe of every sin, and as designed by its divine founder to bear upon sin in all its forms. It is a medicine to cure the moral diseases of society, but like all other medicine, it must be applied to the diseased patient in order to effect a cure. The ministry has this responsibility upon them that if they are derelict in the duty of rebuking sin—God's authorized means for its removal—then they are accountable for all the effects of such unfaithfulness.

But Professor Cleveland need not expect to do any good by his admirable tract. The guilty persons for whom it is designed, filled to bursting with Pharisaical pride, would spurn it with indignation if offered to them for perusal. Who shall undertake to teach the teachers? Hence said Christ, addressing the teachers of his day: "Ye are the salt of the earth, but if the salt has lost his savour where-with shall it be salted?" The last class of men in this country to get right on the subject of slavery and its multi-form relations to the church and the state, is the ministry; and the last department of this class to see and do the truth is, the Doctors of Divinity! When the politicians get right and the people in the pews get right and the elders of the church get right, then after all this, when there is no reprobation to be borne, the priesthood will get right too.

TEXAS, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

Seeing that Texas belongs to this distracted Union, and that its geography, history and statistics, have been the topics of elaborate investigation among intelligent inquirers, among whom Mr. F. L. Olmstead, deserves perhaps a foremost place, it is surprising how much ignorance concerning that State is actually prevalent. Mr. Eli Thayer, for instance, in that Worcester speech, which was reprinted in the Times yesterday, classifies Texas with Kentucky, as a State where the element of slavery has almost ceased to augment, and where the institution, after a short period of stagnation, must presently begin to decline: whereas, so enormous is the yearly increase of slaves—the result of immigration and reproduction—that the number nearly doubles in each period of five years. From indications furnished by the report of the State Comptroller in 1858, there is every reason to anticipate that instead of 58,161, the number in 1850, the census of the present year will present 160,000. This ratio of augmentation is quite equal to that of the most active of the slave-importing States along the Gulf, and places Texas in a category extremely remote from that occupied by Kentucky.—*Times*.

LETTER FROM A LADY.

MR. GOODELL: Enclosed I send you one dollar for the *Principia*, for one year, which you will please send to
* * * * * We seem, in these days, to have christian devotees of all sorts of principles—or perhaps I might better say, *destitute* of principle.

I should greatly mourn this outbreak upon Dr. Cheever, did I not fully believe it will do great good to the cause he so ably and earnestly advocates—yea, and to the Dr. himself, in the end.

The Independent, all unconsciously, illustrates the correctness of Dr. Cheever's position on the slavery question about as forcibly as Mr. Chestnut, in the Senate, did that of Senator Sumner. I have strong faith that God, the all wise and inflexibly just ruler of the universe, will overrule all these wicked machinations for the furtherance of the great cause of truth and righteousness.

I congratulate you on your firmness and boldness—and I congratulate the CHURCH OF THE PURITANS, on their noble *christian* vindication of their church and pastor. It certainly will tell on all *christian* hearts, everywhere. As to myself, before this outbreak, I doubted not where truth and righteousness were, in the controversy; but being so far from the scene and its principal action, I only saw men "as trees walking," but now I have a clear vision—and O my soul, come not thou into the secret of such degradation and crime. Respectfully, &c.

FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE.

We clip the following from the Claremont National Eagle, N. H.

At this session, this A. M. Aug. 29th, of the Congregational General Association of this State.

Rev. Henry T. Cheever of Jewett City, Ct., made an address in behalf of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and the committee on overtures submitted the following Resolutions, the adoption of which was moved and seconded;

Resolved, That in the judgment of this Association, inasmuch as it is an undeniable fact that Christian Churches and the Christian Ministry do, in our country, exert a powerful influence upon public opinion and practice, therefore, on the subject of Slavery and upon the practice of slaveholding—that is, the holding of man as property—the teachings of the Pulpit and of the Church must necessarily be, in the highest degree influential, and if right, must be conclusive and controlling.

Resolved also, That if God has lodged such an influence with the Christian Church and Ministry, and if the position taken by an eminent divine, in this country, (Rev. Albert Barnes,) be the true one, namely: "That there is no power out of the Church that could sustain Slavery an hour, if it were not sustained in it,"—then, it is manifest that the responsibility of a longer continuance of Slavery in the United States rests mainly with Christian Churches and Ministers.

Resolved further, That in the view of this Association, the Church Anti-Slavery Society, which seems to have arisen out of this deep conviction of Church-responsibility in regard to Slavery, in the minds of a few Christian brethren, should have the warm co-operation of other Ministers and Christians, in its honest attempt to array the Churches against Slavery, and to procure from their Pulpits a clear expression of Christian abhorrence of Slaveholding, and a refusal of Christian fellowship with slaveholders on account of their Slaveholding, as the scriptural means of reaching the consciences of Slaveholders, and bringing them to repentance and abandonment of their sin.

Martinsburgh, Aug. 25th, 1860.

Bro Goodell:—Will you permit me through the Principia, to speak of the joy with which Henry Ward Beecher's letter of the 21st "to the President and Board of Trustees of Amherst College" has filled thousands of christian hearts.

Much anxiety was felt on the part of those who prize and rejoice in the simplicity of the gospel when it was known that the title of D. D. had been conferred on Bro. Beecher.

It would seem strange to a heathen man who had read the last part of the 5th and the first part of the 23d chap. of John that there should be any occasion to fear that a professed teacher of the gospel of Christ would accept the title of D. D., but the wicked course of so many others under like circumstances, caused many to fear. But it appears that Bro. Beecher has been sinned against by the fears of those who love him.

May his example, joined to that of Albert Barnes and a few others who might be named, avail to break the spell by which so many ministers of the gospel have been led to break one of the plainest and most positive commands contained in the word of God is my earnest prayer.

Truly yours, S. H. TAFT.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1860.

THE EDITOR has been detained from his Office, and confined at home, by ill health, much of the time for two weeks past. This will explain to friends and correspondents the tardy attention to their Letters and communications, and the delay in the appearance of some articles designed for publication, but requiring, (as most communications do) some preparation for the press, or editorial notice of their contents.—Readers will please excuse any deficiencies or errors they may have noticed, and charitable attribute them in part, to this cause.

TERMS OF OUR PUBLICATIONS, &c. We invite special attention to our revised advertisement of Books and particularly of "Our National Charters" on the last page of this paper.

Our former advertisement, we find, has been sometimes misunderstood.—We sometimes receive moneys covering the precise price of the Books or Pamphlets ordered, without the postage money, the writers, perhaps, thinking that they can pay the postage, at their office, when the publications arrive. But this is not so. The postage has to be paid here, in advance.

Another apprehension has arisen. Remittances and orders have been sent, apparently with the idea that any smaller number of "Our National Charters" might be had at the same rate as we advertized them "per dozen:" whereas we offered them at that low price, to encourage persons to buy "a dozen," instead of a smaller quantity.—We now accommodate the matter by fixing an intermediate price for eight copies, for the convenience of those who wish to remit but one dollar, including the postage—This is the only alteration we can make, that will do ourselves justice, and give even change. Those who want less than 8 copies must pay the retail price. Whoever wants "half a dozen copies" will find that he would be a gainer by sending for eight.

We are furthermore obliged to say that it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any Books, Pamphlets or Tracts, except such as we advertise and keep for sale, in our office. Beside the Editor and Publishing Agent, whose time is fully occupied, we have no one in the office to hunt them up, about the City.

THE LATE ABOLITION CONVENTION AT SYRACUSE.

A brief account of the Nominating Convention at Syracuse, with the names of the Candidates, as copied from the City Daily papers, will be found in our columns.

We have received from the Secretary of the Convention, his Minutes of the Proceedings including the Resolutions, and the Letter of Gerrit Smith to the convention. They will appear in the *Principia* of next week, and—health permitting—with such editorial comments as may be deemed appropriate to the occasion.

A NEW ACCUSATION.

The Tribune of Aug. 31, winds up a long editorial against the Radical Abolitionists, with the statement that their keeping up a distinct political organization,

"Grows out of the impatience which cannot wait the slow but uncertain workings of general law."

How is this? We thought they had always been charged with fanaticism, and decided as "impracticables," because they insisted always, on confining their operations to "the certain workings of general law"—the "abstract principles of moral right"—instead of running after expedients and availabilities, devised to produce immediate effects of some sort, by those who, like the Tribune, have no faith in "the certain workings of general law," or have not patience to wait for the certain results of them.

What is the "general law" of political activity, if it be not the self-evident principles of the declaration of Independence, of the Preamble of the Constitution, and of its

varied provisions for the security of personal freedom?* When, how, and wherein, have the Radical Abolitionists betrayed an "impatience which cannot wait the slow but certain workings of" this "general law?" Who of them have, at any time, manifested any "impatience" of this kind, except those of them whom the Tribune and its associates have seduced to "vote for Clay to keep out Texas," for Garrison to prevent the pro-slavery mobs excited by his Chevoit and Vincennes speeches, by which he purchased Southern support; for Taylor, to rebuke the importation of bloodhounds to hunt the Seminole Indians; for Fremont, to save Kansas, and to rebuke the pro-slavery war, which he helped to prosecute against Mexico, and the pro-slavery votes he had uniformly cast in the Senate? Who among them are proposing to do it now, but those who are preparing to vote with "the white man's party" to enfranchise the colored race—for a party pledged to let slavery alone where it exists, in order to abolish it—for a party in a state of transition from Congressional restriction, to Squatter Sovereignty, (as the editorials of the Tribune bear witness), to keep slavery out of the Territories; for Lincoln to keep out new slave States, repeal the Fugitive Slave law, and abolish slavery in the Federal District; all which, as the Republican campaign documents show, he has declared himself against. In a word, to vote with, and for a party bound hand and foot, by the Slave Power, hugging its chains, and boastfully exhibiting them, in order, forsooth, to "get the Federal Government out of the hands of the slave power!"

If these, and the like of them, be not acting in a spirit of "impatience which cannot wait the slow, but certain action of general law"—where shall we look for its exemplifications?

We have heard of persons, who, in a panic, would throw glass mirrors out of a third story window, upon the stone sidewalk, to save them. But this is less strange than to see sober, "practical business men," running after expedients, as manifestly at war with "the certain workings of general law," as the throwing of glass mirrors from the third story windows upon the stone pavement. Strangely still, that after witnessing the effects of it, for a quarter or a century, they should be found repeating the process, not now, in a panic, as in 1856, but with all the deliberation of the counting house. Who can help asking whether other objects than the ostensible ones are not to be subserved by processes of this kind?

The Tribune's article from which we have made the extract under review, is based, wholly, from beginning to end, upon its "impatience which cannot wait the slow but certain workings of general law," that "general law" which, not only the Tribune, but the whole nation has declared to be self evident, has founded its Constitution and Government upon, still celebrating the anniversary of its adoption, as its "general law," every returning Fourth of July.

The Tribune derides and satirizes the Radical Abolition Convention for nominations, at Syracuse. Why? Because the Convention proposed any thing contrary to that "general law?" No. But because it acted in conformity with that law, and because The Tribune cannot afford to wait for a Presidential victory, until it comes by through the slow, but certain results of it. The zeal of the Radicals outruns their discretion, because they will not do likewise. It pretends that Gerrit Smith, when in Congress, did not dare to act upon "the certain workings of general law," and bedaub him with its slimy commendations for it. It charitably disbelieves that any Radical Abolitionist if in Congress, would be guided and governed by that "general law" at all, any more than is the Tribune itself. The Tribune is a staunch believer in the universality of total human depravity, no doubt. It says:

* Did the Tribune refer to some "general law"—"the slow, but certain workings" of which, would secure the beneficial effects of self-evident truths, while holding them only "in the abstract," without reducing them to practice? A "general law" by which a political party and its leaders, by holding their professed principles in abeyance, to-day, become better prepared to honor them in practice, to-morrow? A "general law" by which a compromise with crime and despotism, will promote rectitude and freedom? A "general law," by which transgressors can be reclaimed, by consenting to transgress with them? A "general law," by which the streams of despotism can be restrained from overspreading the country by non-interference with the great central, and elevated reservoir, from whence, alone, all its streams emanate? If such be the meaning of the Tribune, we confess our utter ignorance of any such law, but are quite familiar with "the certain workings" of a law, of a precisely opposite character. The downward course of the nation, and of the Tribune and its associates, furnishes illustrations of its "workings."

"If there be one thing which the Anglo Saxon mind respects and cherishes, next to Protestantism, it is law. Slavery, wicked as it is, foolish as it is, extravagant as it is, base as it is, cruel as it is, pernicious as it is, morally, mechanically, materially, politically, economically, intellectually, religiously, in every possible human relation, is yet notwithstanding all this, held to be by the people of this country, legal in the States where it exists.

But does the Tribune thus hold it to be "legal in the States where it exists?" No. It fully endorsed, and enthusiastically praised Gen. A. P. Granger's terse, explicit, pithy, and defiant speech in Congress, to the contrary, and affirming the power of the Federal Government to abolish slavery in the States. This, the Tribune, over the signature of its senior Editor, "H. G.," predicted, would be pronounced, officially, to be the law of the land, "whenever the Judges can afford to be honest."

Can the Tribune itself "afford to be honest?"—Or is it too impatient "to wait the slow but certain action of general law?"

We are glad to have the testimony of the Tribune to the paramount authority of "general law" and to the wisdom of "patience to wait the slow and certain workings" of that law. It is in this patience that we labor, as well as wait. We are not in such hot haste to do something, as to run counter to what we know to be "general law" and what the whole nation has declared to be such, and to be self-evident. We can afford to work with a small, derided party, or with none at all, while we insist on a rigid, and unwavering obedience to that law. We can afford to bear all the taunts and sneers of the Tribune. We know that law will stand, while the Divine Throne stands, and that no party can do anything beneficial, while it ignores it. All we ask and desire of our fellow citizens is, that they may share in our faith, and participate in our labors, and in the fruits of them.

We rejoice to see the certain workings of that law, in the overthrow of the Democratic party, for no other fault but ignoring it. We see in it, the certain overthrow of the Republican party, unless it quits the policy of ignoring it, an overthrow the more speedy for its temporary success. We rejoice in the belief that the party, or a party, adhering to that law, will yet save the country. If not, we do know, assuredly, that by "the slow but certain workings of general law" and its fearful penalty, the nation and its liberties will be inevitably wrecked. We hope better things, because we know there are thousands who have faith in that law, and patience to wait for its certain workings.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

JULY 27th, 1860.

Dear Friend Goodell.—I am a reader and admirer of the "Principia." It is always a welcome visitor; and so soon as read, it is sent on a mission to others.

Your view on the unconstitutionality of slavery, is the only one to which I feel inclined to take exception. Whilst reading your arguments in the No. of July 21, in vindication of the Constitution, the following difficulties presented themselves to my mind, and I would humbly present them to you for solution.

In the representative clause, if the three-fifths mean aliens, why were the three-fifths of the slave population allowed to be added in forming the basis of representation?

If the persons mentioned in the importation clause, mean foreigners, why did the law of Congress of 1808, in reference to said clause, prohibit the foreign African slave trade instead of the immigration of foreigners?

3. If, in the rendition clause, indentured apprentices are meant instead of slaves, how happened it that Washington, under this clause, made requisition on one of the States for a runaway slave?

4. In case of an indentured apprentice fleeing from his master into another State, is it the legal mode of procedure to make requisition on the State for said fugitive?

By answering the above interrogatories, you will oblige an enquiring FRIEND.

ANSWERS.

1. Our friend's first question is founded, (as, in substance are the succeeding ones,) on an assumption that, if admitted, would make Constitutions of no binding force on Legislatures, to restrain them from any legislation whatever. The assumption is, that the meaning of a Constitution is to be determined by the action of the Legislature that undertakes to administer it. Whatever Congress may do, according to this assumption, becomes constitutional of course, though one Congress may do the very reverse of another. No act of a Legislature could then be set aside as un-

stitutional, because the *Act itself*, would be a conclusive proof of its own constitutionality, whatever its provisions might be. No question concerning the constitutionality of an act of Congress could then be raised, at all. If Congress charters a National Bank, or enacts a prohibitory tariff, the question of their constitutionality is thereby settled. The will of Congress, for the time being, becomes the Constitution, and, in effect, we have no Constitution at all. No statesman of any political party, has ever set up, or admitted a principle of constitutional exposition like this. When Jefferson recommended the purchase of Louisiana, he admitted that the Federal Government had no constitutional authority to purchase it. So he recommended and gave his signature to an unconstitutional act, admitting it to be such, but he knew better than to tell the people that it was constitutional, because the Government had done it. Nobody denies—almost everybody believes—that Congress has done a great many unconstitutional things. Every Administration perhaps, has been charged with some infringement of the Constitution. Washington's and Adams' administrations certainly were, and a majority of the people believed it, and protested against it, at the ballot box, and turned the party of Washington and Adams, (the Federal party) out of power, under the stigma of it, and put in Jefferson in their place, who had won his popularity by denouncing, as unconstitutional, the general policy, and particular enactments of those administrations, particularly the alien and sedition laws, which Washington, Adams, Jay and Hamilton, approved.

Our friend's argument proves too much. It proves the constitutionality of the present Fugitive slave bill, of the Dred Scott decision, of the Crittenden Lecompton bill—or of the English swindle—all the official measures of Presidents Pierce and Buchanan, to crush out liberty in Kansas. By such an assumption, an act of Congress offering a reward, and making an appropriation of \$50,000 each, for the heads of Senators Sumner and Seward, Dr. Cheever, and Horace Greeley, would be constitutional, of course.

We have dwelt the longer on the illustration of this fallacy, because it is, *at bottom*, the main argument of those who, whether pro-slavery, or anti-slavery, maintain the pro-slavery character of the Constitution. The constitutionality of the Senate's imprisonment of Thaddeus Hyatt, has been assumed, both by abolitionists and by pro-slavery men, on the same ground. Not many weeks, or months since, we had to confront an argument of the *Anti-slavery Bugle*, triumphantly adduced, the point of which was, that Radical Political Abolitionists were mistaken in supposing that the Constitution forbade the deprivation of liberty, in the case of the slaves, "without due process of law," because the Senate had imprisoned Thaddeus Hyatt, without due process of law. Just as though the will of the Senate determined or proved the meaning of the Constitution, in either of the cases, or in any case.

We have often listened, by the hour, to this argument in anti-slavery conventions, sometimes urged by a class of abolitionists, sometimes by pro-slavery men. Scores of times, perhaps, have we exposed the fallacy, in print, and in oral debate, and never without putting it at rest, for the time being. But ever and anon, it comes up again, from some new quarter, as fresh as ever, showing the deep hold it has taken upon the public mind. It is, by, essentially, the same fallacy, that the Bible is assumed to be pro-slavery, because so many of its official expounders have claimed it to be so, and because so many professed believers and followers of the Bible, are found to be pro-slavery, and even slaveholders. Is it not high time to lay such logic aside? If we cannot, we might as well yield up the right of reading our Bibles and our Constitutions for ourselves, commit them into the hands of pro-slavery priests and politicians, let them do our thinking for us, and submit to be fettered, in mind and limb, with as much composure as we can.

II. Our Friend's second question is answered in answering his first. But there is another thing to be noticed here, in addition. The law of Congress, prohibiting the slave trade, in 1808, was warranted of course, by a general grant of power in the Constitution, to prohibit the importation of foreigners, after that time. For imported slaves are included among other foreigners. And under the general power, Congress might exclude some, without excluding others. The Constitution only enabled, but did not require Congress to exclude any—and to exclude whom it pleased.

III. Our Friend's third question has also been answered in answering his first, though the phase of the thing is somewhat changed. His first had reference to an act of Congress, his third, to the supposed action of a President. So that his implied argument here, supposes that an act of a President, as well as a statute of Congress, determines the meaning of the Constitution—thus making the *President's will* the Constitution, which would render him a despot above all written Constitutions, and with power to annull them at his pleasure.

But our Friend, we think, mistakes the facts of the case. We have never understood that Washington, as *President*, made any "requisition" on Gov. Gilman as *Governor* of New Hampshire, for the rendition of his fugitive servant—or that he made any "requisition" at all, under the clause of the Constitution, or under the Fugitive Act of 1793. We have always understood that he *did not*. We understand that George Washington, in his individual capacity, wrote a private letter to his friend, Gov. Gilmer, requesting his assistance in reclaiming his fugitive female slave, whose services were very much missed by Mrs. Washington. But, so far from making any "requisition" either under the Constitution, or under the act of 1793, he especially enjoined that if it could not be done, without exciting unpleasant feelings, it should not be done at all. Gov. Gilmer accordingly sent word to the woman, and she, being indisposed to return, was not sent back. Gov. Gilmer seems not to have recognized any constitutional obligation in the case.

IV. In case of an indentured apprentice fleeing to another State, the clause of the Constitution, undoubtedly does forbid the passage of any State enactment preventing his being reclaimed by a regular process of law, but, on the contrary, directs that he shall be given up to the party to whom "service or labor may be due"—the indebtedness being duly substantiated in Court. As to "a requisition on the *State*," (or its authorities) "for said fugitive" whether slave or apprentice, the Constitution says nothing—the acts of 1793, and 1850, say nothing—nor has such been the practice, that we know of, from the beginning to the present. Certainly it is not the usage now. Quite another device than *State* appliances are provided, as the present condition of things bears witness, particularly in Wisconsin.

POLITICAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION IN THE CITY OF WORCESTER, MASS.

An adjourned meeting of the Political Anti-Slavery Convention, which met in the city of Boston, on the 29th day of May last, will be held in the city of Worcester, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 19th and 20th days of September next, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

The object of this Convention is to consider the propriety of organizing a *Political Party* upon an Anti-Slavery interpretation of the U. S. Constitution, with the avowed purpose of abolishing slavery in the States, as well as Territories of the Union. At its former meeting, resolutions setting forth the great principles of liberty and equality which must underlie and permeate a political movement, to entitle it to the confidence and support of the friends of freedom, were introduced and discussed, but without taking action upon them, the Convention adjourned to meet in the city of Worcester, at the call of the President and Chairman of the Business Committee.

In discharging the duty thus devolved upon us, we now make an appeal to you, fellow-citizens, lovers of freedom of both sexes, in behalf of four millions of enslaved countrymen, who, in the name of justice and a common brotherhood, demand their liberty at your hands.

Nearly an entire generation has passed away since the commencement of the present Anti-Slavery agitation, and yet slavery is still triumphant over our whole land! There is not yet a single foot of soil, in all this broad Republic, on which the escaping slave can stand, and feel that he is free!

There is not yet in existence a political party, (if we except a meagre local organization in a single State,) which does not shamelessly avow the purpose to wield the National sword in defence of the bloody slave system, wherever it exists under State jurisdiction! The Church is still in league with the tyrant, with both her heels upon the necks of his helpless victims! We have had discussions upon the character of slavery and the sources of its power, till the whole subject is thoroughly understood by all who have any disposition to investigate. What now remains for us, therefore, is ACTION. Our only hope of success is in translating our sentiments into statutes, and coining our words into deeds!

What the slave demands of us is protection. It is not enough that we stand aloof from his oppressors—that we

have "No union with slaveholders." We can only make good our claim to be regarded as his friends, by throwing around his liberty and rights the legal safeguards on which we depend for the protection of our own.

For this purpose, we invite to this Convention all who desire to see the principles of the Declaration of Independence incorporated into the administration of our National Government, and our country thus purged of the hypocrisy which has made its very name a reproach to the cause of freedom, in all lands!

We especially desire the presence and co-operation of those who are not content with mere words, but prefer to prove their faith by their works. Here is a field in which the largest powers will find ample scope.

Come! you who have hitherto stood aloof from this holy enterprise, because its leaders presented no "plan"! Here you will see presented a plan which is at once morally just, politically consistent, and practically efficient.

Come! you who minister at the altars of our religion, and aid us in erecting a political platform on which you can stand, and act for the protection of your own rights, without thereby becoming accomplices and abettors in the crime of enslaving millions of your countrymen. Come, and help us wipe out the deep infamy which now covers your churches, for their support of a government which legalizes the sale of American Women in its Capital, and protects the infamous practice in half the States of the Union!

Come! you who profess to take the Christian Scriptures as the rule of your faith and practice, and no longer stand before the world identified with parties which openly contemn the divine command, "Thou shall not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee."

Come! you who, on account of your sex, are excluded by all existing parties from your God-given right to participate in the management of political affairs. We greatly need the aid of your superior moral instincts in the difficult experiment of laying the foundations of a party in which not sex, nor color, but superior merit shall be the passport to preferment.

Come! especially, you whose hearts are yet warm with the generous impulses of uncorrupted youth. Aid us, by your inspiring presence and ardent zeal, in this sublime effort to re-construct the rotten fabric of our Republic, that we may have the happiness of bequeathing to you, our children, a National Patrimony, which you will not blush to accept at our hands as evidence of a noble ancestry!

To all who desire to see slavery speedily and peacefully abolished, and our beloved country free, united and happy,—young and old, men and women, clergy and laity,—again we say, Come up to this Convention! Unite your efforts with ours in this divine attempt to outlaw the Slave Power, and place Justice on the throne. God has given us the power; we only lack the wisdom and the will! The bloody institution holds its lease of life, to day, only from the divisions in the ranks of its enemies.

We aim at UNION! Our purpose is to present to the public a Platform on which all the genuine friends of freedom can stand, side by side, without the sacrifice of principle, or of honor, each contending with the weapon of his choice, and thus to gather up that vast harvest of scattered and dormant anti-slavery feeling which more than a quarter of a century of seed-growing has produced, and concentrate in one grand, continuous, systematic assault upon the citadel of slavery, until its walls shall crumble, and its destruction shall be as signal and complete, as its triumph has hitherto been haughty and irresistible.

Friends of the oppressed! let our fondest hopes be more than realized in your hearty response to this summons to a new and untried field of conflict with the Slave Power.

In behalf of the Convention,

JOHN PIERPONT, President.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER, C. B. Com.

Worcester, August 10, 1860.

ILLINOIS STATE CONVENTION.

NOTICE.

There will be a State Radical Abolition Convention held in the town of Lexington, Mc Lean County, Illinois, on the nineteenth day of September, (Wednesday,) at 10, o'clock A. M., for the purpose of nominating State Electors to support the Nominees of the Radical Abolition Party for President and Vice President of the United States, and also for the purpose of effecting a complete organization of the party throughout the State, for the coming campaign.

It is desirable that every Radical Abolitionist in the State should either be present or send in his name with Post-Office address. Please address all letters to JOHN W. MAHAN, Acting Secy., "of State Central Committee, Lexington Ills."

Signed.

JOHN HOSACK,
DR. J. STOUT, { Ottawa, Ills.
G.W. BASSETT,
H. H. HINMAN, Pontiac, Ills.
JOHN W. MAHAN, Lexington, Ills.

Acting State Central Committee.

Dated, Lexington, Ills., Aug. 24, 1860.

EUROPE.

The Africa left Liverpool on the 18th and Queenstown, on the 19th ult. The Fulton from Havre, via Southampton, 22d:

The report that the Austrian Cabinet had declared its intention to assume the offensive if Garibaldi should succeed in effecting a revolution in Naples, is not officially confirmed. It is certain that up to the 15th ult., no Austrian note embodying any such views had reached Turin. Authorities differ as to whether the document is really in existence. A statement made in the *Constitutionnel* by M. Gragubnillot, publishing secretary of the French Government, that "within two months Italy would be free and completely independent, or Austria would again reign, and this time from Messina to Turin—has excited considerable attention in political circles, and drawn from the London *Times* an article of the alarmist type. Most interesting accounts have been received of the departure of the first Italian expedition to invade the main coast. It seems to be still a matter of doubt whether or not Garibaldi in person landed in Calabria.

PROCLAMATION TO THE NEAPOLITANS.

The following proclamation by the Sicilian Dictator has been circulated in Naples:

To the People of the Neapolitan Continent.

The opposition of the foreigner, interested in our abasement, and internal factions have prevented Italy from constituting herself a country. Now, however, it appears that Providence has put as end to so many misfortunes. The exemplary unanimity of all the provinces, and Victory smiling every where on the arms of the sons of liberty, are a proof that the sufferings of this land of genius are drawing to their termination. Yet another step remains. That step I do not fear. If the slight means which have conducted a handful of valiant men to these Straits are compared with the enormous means at our disposal at present, every eye will see that the enterprise is not difficult. I would that the shedding of blood among Italians could be avoided, and therefore I address myself to you. Sons of the Neapolitan continent, I have proved that you are brave, but I desire not to make further proof of it. Our blood we will shed together on the bodies of the enemies of Italy. But between us let there be a truce. Accept, generous men, the right hand which has never served a tyrant, but which is hardened in the service of the people. I ask of you to constitute Italy without slaughter of her sons, and with you serve her and die for her.

G. GARIBALDI.

MESSINA, August 6.

MYSTERIOUS ABSENCE OF GARIBALDI.

Special Correspondence of the Times.

FARO, Sunday 12, 2 P.M.

In the hope of catching the French mail to Marseilles, I write a few words to announce to you the following Order of the day, which has been just given out:

ORDER OF THE DAY.

FARO, Sunday Aug. 12.

Officers and Soldiers of the Land and Sea Forces:

The General Dictator having for a short time quitted headquarters, left me the following Order:

GENERAL SIETORI.—I leave to you the command of the land and sea forces, being obliged to leave for a few days.

G. GARIBALDI.

Officers and Soldiers: My greatest title to your confidence is the confidence which the man repose in me who represents your noblest aspirations. I trust that you will obey me as you would obey Gen. Garibaldi.

G. SIRTORI, Chief of the Staff.

What is the exact meaning of this is as yet a mystery which has to be cleared up. Some circumstances which occurred this morning may help to throw some light on the mystery. A Sardinian frigate was at the Faro this morning. Dr. Bertani has arrived from Genoa, and has brought, it is said, important news.

Lord Palmerston, being questioned on the subject, said that Government had no information of enlistment going on in England, but if it had, immediate steps would be taken to stop it.

Advices from Damascus to the 5th inst. state that Fuad Pacha had surrounded the Lebanon with troops, and threatened fire and sword if the Druse Sheikhs did not surrender in two days. Twenty had already been taken, and nearly 800 important arrests had been made. One thousand camel loads of plundered property had been recovered.

Lord Palmerston has also stated that the British Commission to Syria had received instructions to demand the restoration of the Christian women carried off and sold to the Druses.

The wheat harvest had partially commenced in the south of England, and the crops were reported good. The weather, however, continued wet and unsettled, and hot sunshine was much needed. The European *Times*, of the 18th ult., says upon the subject:

"The fears about the harvest are every day becoming worse. The accounts from Ireland are desponding, and the

potato disease in many districts is deepening in virulence. The same cold, damp weather which has so long prevailed on this side of the Channel appears to have been pretty general in the sister country. Strange to say, Scotland is the part of the United Kingdom where the prospect is most cheering. There they actually complain of a deficiency of moisture. A friend of ours, in coming from London a day or two back, through the Trent Valley, found the whole country, for forty or fifty miles under water. It appeared like one vast lake, and the tops of the cereal crops were alone visible. Such state of things in the middle of August is almost unprecedented. Still it would appear, from the state of the corn markets, that this is exceptional, for the accounts from the more southern and western districts are comparatively favorable. No doubt the market is considerably influenced by the arrivals which are daily coming in, but that we shall have to import largely can scarcely admit of a doubt."

The steamer *City of Manchester* left Liverpool, Aug. 22 and Queenstown 23d. The following is the Summary of News obtained.

Garibaldi has landed in Calabria.

PARIS, Wednesday.—Dispatches announce a serious disturbance in Basilicata.

Several corps of Garibaldians have landed and met with success. It is not known whether Garibaldi is present or not.

LONDON, Thursday.—*The Daily News* confirms the announcement that the Calabrians are in open revolt against the King of Naples and in favor of Garibaldi.

The French Government has abandoned the project of raising Spain to the rank of a great power at present.

IMPORTANT FROM MEXICO.

NEW ORLEANS, Monday, Sept. 3. 1860.

The steamship Austin has arrived here with Brazos dates of the 30th ult., and \$170,000 in specie.

The Brazos River was very high and fears were entertained of a destructive flood.

A number of Monterey merchants had gone to Brownsville in consequence of the new forced loan proclaimed by Vidaurre at San Luis on the 16th ult.

A battle was fought at Lagos between Miramon and Degollado, on the 10th ult. Miramon with 2,000 men tried to cut his way through, but his force was surrounded by Degollado with 2,800 men. The fight lasted five days. Miramon was badly wounded but escaped with a few of his cavalry. He lost all his artillery, and the remainder of his army were made prisoners.

Gen. Pacheco was killed, and Gen. Megia made prisoner. Miramon was in full flight.

There was great rejoicing at the Capital and throughout the country in consequence of Miramon's defeat.

GEN. WALKER'S MOVEMENTS.

The correspondent of *The N. Y. Herald*, writing from Managua under date of July 31, says:

"The accompanying spirited address has been issued to the people by the acting President, Chamorro, calling all patriots to the rescue and defence of the country against Walker and his officers and the hordes of cannibals behind him, who are all said to be at this writing in the island of Ruan-

"The State of Honduras has advised the Government here that William is actually at Ruatan, and, of course, coming to Nicaragua. You will see by the address that the post of honor must be at Ruatan, and there is the place where the 'valientes' are to meet. I doubt, however, that the army of Nicaragua take up the line of march for that interesting point.

PROCLAMATION.

"FERNANDO CHAMORRO, Senator, charged with the Executive power of the Republic of Nicaragua, to the inhabitants:

"COMPATRIOTS: William Walker, the enemy of our repose, with a party of his robbers, menaces at this moment our neighbor and sister, the Republic of Honduras; the danger is likewise ours: the question is Central American.

"The ruins which his destructive hands scattered far and near are yet smoking; these continually make us remember what we may expect from these hordes of cannibals. The religion of our fathers, our paternal hearths, our beloved families, the very soil under our feet, all, all will be taken from us by force should that heartless people (*gente*)—whose professed principle is the destruction of our race—take possession of the country.

"Our past dissensions were the cause that in the late invasion the contest was prolonged and the idea of our easy conquest conceived. Now united, we have but one standard, independence—one enemy, filibusters. The time and occasion has come for us to prove to the whole world that we are able to defend our rights, and that our territory is not to be trodden with impunity.

"Clergymen of the Republic! The holy religion of which ye are the ministers is menaced; fulfil your evangelical mission!

"Proprietors, fellow-citizens, all! You know the gravity of the danger. The government reposes in the security that each of you is prepared promptly to comply with the duties imposed upon you by your country.

"Soldiers of the Army! The miserable Vandals whom you caused to bite the dust of San Jacinto, Massaya, Rivas, and Granada, dare again to challenge your ferocity (*bravura*). Prepare your-

selves. At whatever point of Central America they may appear, it is to us also that the challenge is extended. There is the danger of our country; there, honor and our oaths calls us, and there, as heretofore, in your ranks will be found your companion and friend.

"Managua, July 20, 1860." FERNANDO CHAMORRO.

"Nothing further has been heard as to Walker's whereabouts; but great alarm and excitement are said to exist on account of his supposed proximity to the country, and the foreign residents (more particularly the Americans) are regarded with suspicion, and treated with great coolness by the authorities and the people.

A Russian built brig, carrying the New-Granadian flag, with about forty passengers on board, principally Americans, from San Francisco, had arrived at La Union, on the Pacific. Their destination is said to be Honduras. Possibly they intend joining Gen. Walker."

WISCONSIN.—THE HARVEST.—A letter to the *Tribune*, dated Baraboo, Sauk County, Wis., Aug. 25, says;

In the *Semi-weekly Tribune* of four days ago, you say: "A private letter from Wisconsin assures us that the new wheat threshes out even better than the estimates; and that the crop will not fall short of thirty millions of bushels. Let me refer you to the report of the Committee sent out by our State Agricultural Society, which placed it at from twenty-two to twenty-five millions before a kernel was threshed, and that on the supposed average of twenty bushels per acre. Our country has not an acre of wheat this year, that will produce as low as twenty bushels. Among the reports from fifteen threshing machines that have been at work in Sauk County during the last ten days, the lowest figure named is twenty-three, and the highest forty-seven!" We claim an average of twenty-eight or thirty.

Yours, truly, R. JONES.

DUMAS AND GARIBALDI.—Alexander Dumas is about to start a Journal in Palermo, with the title of the *Indipendente*. On this subject, Garibaldi wrote the following letter: "MELAZZO, July 21, The Journal which my friend Dumas is about to publish in Palermo, will be called the *Indipendente*, a title which it will all the more deserve, because the founder will not spare me, if ever I should deviate from my principles, and my duty as a child of the people. G. GARIBALDI."

THE HARVEST IN ROCK CO.—The harvest is ended, and the crops have been secured in excellent order. The threshing machines have commenced their work. In nearly every instance, so far as we have heard, the yield is greater than expected. We hear of instances of 25, 30, and even 40 bushels to the acre. There is scarcely a doubt that Rock County has raised this year, 2,000,000 bushels of wheat.—*Janesville Gazette*.

Thomas Dascomb, of Roxbury, Mass., died of hydrocephalus on Sunday last, having been bitten by one of his dogs about a week previous. Soon after being attacked by the fatal disease, he became delirious, barked like a dog, and turned somersaults in his bed with a strength which two men were unable to control, and finally expired after horrible suffering.

Family Miscellany.

For "The Principia."

PSALM IX. 1-10.

1 With my whole heart, I'll praise thee, O Lord, My God, my King: Thy wondrous works of mercy, With gladness will I sing.

2 My foes turn'd back before thee, They perish'd at thy sight; * Enthroned in power and glory, Thou hast maintained my right.

3 Thou hast rebuked the heathen, And covered them with shame, Thou hast destroyed the wicked, And blotted out their name.

4 The proud abodes they cherish'd, Have fall'n, to rise no more; Their fame has with them perish'd, Their ravages are o'er.

5 But God shall reign forever, His throne, for judgment stand, To shelter and deliver The oppress'd of every land.

6 A tow'r, in times of trouble, To those that trust thy grace, For thou hast not forsaken, The souls that seek thy face.

W. G.

"NOTHING MINE BUT GOD."—In recently looking through the memoir of Mrs. Savage, the sister of Matthew Henry, the commentator, we notice this entry on her diary: "Resolved to call nothing mine but God." This reminded us of the Saviour's requirement: "Whosoever he be of you that forsakes not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple," and also of the apostle's representation of the Christian possessions; "All things are yours." Truly, if this be so, "he that loseth his life shall find it."

For The Principia.
CAUSES AND CURE OF POVERTY.

CHAPTER III.

AIM AND OBJECT OF EXERTION.

Consideration, Decision of character, Resolution, and Perseverance, have already been mentioned, as essential to success in life, and the absence or opposites of them have been shown to be among the chief causes of Poverty, destitution, and want.

But consideration, decision, resolution, and perseverance, pre-suppose an object to be attained by the exercise of them.

What, then, is the object necessary for a man to have in view, to stimulate him to the proper exercise of his powers?

The reader will, perhaps, wonder at this question, in this place. As the writer is treating of poverty, its causes, and its cure, it will perhaps be taken for granted that the accumulation of property, or, at least, the avoidance of poverty, constitute the main or sole object that a man needs to have in view, in order to stimulate and sustain the exertions required.

But this is not so. A man, must, indeed, aim to avoid poverty and to acquire a competent supply for his necessities; yet he will be liable to think superficially, to plan unwise, to act feebly, to become discouraged, jaded out and disheartened, unless he looks to something beyond. Do you dread poverty? Very well: But why do you dread it? Do you desire property? So far, so good. But why do you desire it? Is it merely the fear of hunger and starvation, of nakedness and lack of shelter, that drives you to work? If this is all you are after, your aims rise no higher than those of the savage, and your thoughts, plans, purposes, contrivances, resolutions, decisions, and patient persevering industry and forecast will not be likely to rise higher than his. The results of your efforts will be like his.

Did you ever consider the life of a savage, and inquire why it is, that savages never acquire property, to any extent, nor rise to civilized life?

The reason is simply this. The object and aim of the savage is only the present supply of his immediate necessities, as a mere animal being, the satisfying of his hunger, a covering and a shelter from the cold. Beyond this he has no object, no aim. Look at the Indian of the western forest. Enter his wigwam; notice his habits, and study his character. See how he idles away his time, and sleeps and lounges about, till hunger rouses him to the chase. Notice his agility, skill, and vigor, till his supply of game is procured. Then see him settle down again in listlessness and languor, till hunger again rouses him to activity. Aside from hunting and fishing, as his present necessities compel him, he does little more than to construct his bow and arrows, his implements for fishing, his preparation of a rude blanket and moccasins. His architecture rises no higher than the erection of a temporary wigwam. His knowledge and prosecution of agriculture terminate in the planting of little patches of corn, potatoes, and tobacco, without the help of the plow.

What is the philosophy of all this?

The Indian has learned to aim at no higher object than the supply of his actual physical necessities. His wants as a rational, thinking, moral being, have never been taken into the account, nor planned for, in his economy of human life. So that the mere dread of poverty, or in other words, the fear or the fact of hunger, nakedness, cold, and want of shelter, have furnished the only motive of his action. He never rises above a state of poverty, because he never aims to rise far above it. He looks to nothing beyond the satisfying of appetite, exemption from pain, the preservation of life.

"To be, contents his natural desire."

In order to rise above the poverty of the savage, you must have higher and nobler aims than the savage. To avoid poverty you must have some higher objects in view, than merely to avoid poverty. You must aim at education, knowledge, usefulness in society, social improvement, social enjoyment, rational intercourse, or you will never rise above the condition of the savage. In some respects, if you live in a civilized country, you will be in danger of sinking below it. For savage life, in the woods, with all

its brutality and destitution, has some advantage over brutality and destitution, among us. The forest and the chase favor manly independence and vigor; whereas brutality and destitution in our cities are connected with squalor and degrading dependence. Yet brutality and destitution will be found, wherever the aims and objects of men rise no higher than the mere supply of physical wants—no higher than the dread of hunger, the fear of starvation, the necessity of sustaining animal life.

Look among the poor of New York city, and see if it is not so. Enter the dwellings of the miserably poor and destitute. Exceptions to the general fact will be found, but the great majority of cases will illustrate our argument. The objects and aims of life, among them, are, and have been no higher than those of the western savage, the supply of the wants, and the gratification of the appetites of the man, as a mere animal. In this latter particular, the chief difference consists. The Indian, except in his use of tobacco, and of the white man's whiskey, seeks only the supply of his natural wants. The city savage adds to this, the desire to indulge in the vicious gratifications and amusements that he finds within his reach. The poverty and misery at the Five Points, need no further explanation than this. Man has aspired to no destiny higher than that of a mere animal, a brute. And therefore he has sunk beneath it. God never intended that man should escape poverty and destitution, unless he aimed at something higher and better than merely to escape it.

Extend, now, your observation to a large class of our city population that ought not to be classed, exactly, with the inhabitants of the Five Points, though some of them may be tending thitherward. Do the masses of our day laborers and journeymen mechanics aim at any higher object than the present supply of their physical wants whether natural or artificial?

If not, wherein does their philosophy of life rise higher than that of the savage? And wherein do the results differ? The savage hunts, till he gets a supply of venison, and then lies still till he wants more. The day laborer works when hunger, or the immediate fear of it, presses him, then lounges in the dram-shop, smokes cigars, and runs riot, till necessity again drives him to labor. The journeyman mechanic, while there is a demand for his work, or when he does not prefer idleness, riots in luxuries, goes to the theatre, and squanders his money. And whenever employ fails him, either through his own fault or otherwise, he is distressed for want of bread for his family, when a little fore-sight and economy might have placed him above want. And all because he had no higher aim than to eat, drink, and be merry, and never had any higher aim in life than mere animal enjoyment. He meant to secure this, but aiming at nothing more, fell short of it.

LIFE WITHOUT LOVE.

We sometimes meet with men who seem to think that any indulgence in an affectionate feeling is a weakness. They will return from a journey and greet their families with a distant dignity, and move among their children with the cold and lofty splendor of an iceberg surrounded by its broken fragments. There is hardly a more unnatural sight on earth than one of those families without a heart. A father had better extinguish a boy's eyes than take away his heart. Who that has experienced the joys of friendship, and values sympathy and affection, would not rather lose all that is beautiful in nature's scenery than be robbed of the hidden treasures of his heart? Cherish, then your heart's best affections. Indulge in the warm and gushing emotions of filial, parental, and fraternal love.

LOOK UP!

A young man once picked up a sovereign in the road. Ever afterwards, as he walked along, he kept his eyes fixed steadily on the ground, in hopes of finding another. And in the course of a long time he did pick up, at different times, a goodly number of coins, gold and silver. But all these years, while he was looking for them, he saw not that the heavens were bright above him, and nature beautiful around. He never once allowed his eyes to look up from the mud and filth in which he sought his treasure; and when he died, a rich old man, he only knew this fair earth of ours as a dirty road in which to pick up money as you go along.

It is less pain to learn in youth, than to be ignorant in old age.

GREAT MEN.

A great man is always willing to be little. Whilst he sits on the cushion of advantages, he goes to sleep. When he is pushed, disappointed, tormented, defeated, he has a chance to learn something; he has been put on his wits; he has gained facts; he learns his ignorance; is cured of the insanity of conceit; has got moderation and real skill. The wise man always throws himself on the side of his assailants. It is more to his interest than it is theirs to find his weak point. The wound cicatrizes and falls off from him like a dead skin, and when they would triumph, lo, he has passed on invulnerable.—As long as all that is said is against me, I feel a certain assurance of success. But as soon as honeyed words of praise are spoken for me, I feel as one that lies unprotected before his enemies.—Emerson.

THE TRUE BLUE.—Everybody has heard the designation "true blue," applied to Presbyterians. Rev. Dr. Murray, in his speech before the assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, at the tri-centenary celebration, thus playfully refers to its origin:

"I have often been asked why we are called 'true blue.' I did not know how to answer. But I asked a Scotchman 'Well,' said he, 'when we were persecuted the ministers used to go to the mountains, when they were going to have a communion they held a blue flag, which was an invitation to the people of the country around to attend; and their descendants are called true blue from that.' That is one explanation, but I have found out another for myself. A few years ago I was in Naples and Rome, and went to Pompeii, where I spent some time among its splendid frescoes of variegated blues. All the other colors had faded away but the blue was as bright as the day it was put on, although it had been buried for nearly two thousand years. The true blue never gave out—that is the meaning of it. [Laughter.] True blue Presbyterianism is so blue that it never gives out."

We could wish that there were more "true blue" abolitionists, temperance men, and christians, if this latter be the true meaning of the phrase.

Sidney Smith once said in an aristocratic party, that 'a man, to know how bad he is, must become poor; to know how bad other people are, he must become rich. Many a man thinks it is virtue that keeps him from turning rascal, when it is only a full stomach. One should be careful and not mistake potatoes for principles.'

It is more glorious to bear misfortunes with patience, than to desire death to avoid them.

Let friendship creep gently to a height. If it rush to it, it may soon run itself out of breath.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*:
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50..... Postage 30cts.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00 Postage 25cts.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 75..... Postage 15cts.

FOR THE MILLIONS.

- I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
- II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
- III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
- IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. By WILLIAM GOODELL.

A summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal Opinions*, collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. An APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers, &c.

Price, Single Copies, 12 cents; if by mail, 15 cents, and at the same rate for any number short of 8 copies.

Eight copies, by mail, \$1 00, or 76 cents, at the Office.

Twelve copies, by mail, \$1 36, or \$1 00 at the Office.

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the Principia, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH, always paid at our Post-Office in advance, so that we cannot answer orders as above, without having received the postage money, as well as the price of the publications.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be paid at our Post-Office in advance, so that we cannot answer orders as above, without having received the postage money, as well as the price of the publications.

We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, except those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.

THE ANALYST.

A weekly Family Paper, devoted to Temperance, Progress, and Social Improvement, published by M. H. ALLARDT, 197 Superior Street, Cleveland, O.—Send for Specimens.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.

VOL. I
Published by
Harper's Bu

TERMS :
Direct bu
as above.
Our object,
Christian refor
killed crimin
ties, business a
the Church, the
God, restoring
our expeditio
ses; our pa...
RADICAL

This meet
29th of Au
was chosen
dent, and G
retaries. I
A Busine
Gordon of
Foster of M
C. Stanton
Letter of Ho
Convention
of Mich., Ja
Jas. Catlin
A Comm
Chas. A. H
for the pur
tion of tick
Two o'clock
The Busin
Bailey, edit
Ky., addres
and complai
cals of Ken
adjourned t

Mr. Geo
fered a reso
towards the
able discuss
nations.

C. A. Ha
which, afte
respective
Samuel L
dent.

A collect
penses.

A Nation
W. W. Cha
E. C. Stant
McCormick
took a rece
the Chair, a
ett of Ousei
The follo
Presidential
Electors a
District I